

REMARKS

The Office Action dated November 20, 2006 has been received and carefully reviewed. In the above amendment, claims 1, 16, 18, and 20 have been amended without introduction of new matter. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 19 was rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failure to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. In particular, page 2 of the Office Action indicated that the limitation "distance sensors that are connected to the remote control device" is indefinite because the remote control does not appear to be positively recited in claim 16. In addition, the Office Action at page 3 stated (regarding claims 16-19 and 24) that "it does not appear that a remote control device is positively recited in these claims". In the above amendment, claims 16 and 24 have been amended to positively recite a remote control device, whereby the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is believed to have been overcome without addition of new matter. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of claim 16 is therefore respectfully requested.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2, and 8-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Holler 6,134,849 in view of Jones 5,842,667. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these claim rejections is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons. By the above amendment, the independent claims 1, 18, and 20 have been amended to provide that the hall allows the flying unit to fly freely and safely within the boundaries, where the hall boundaries and the flying unit operation prevent the flying unit from leaving the hall without safety risk. This feature is neither taught nor suggested by Holler or Jones, whereby the above amendment is believed to have rendered the claims 1, 2, and 8-26 non-obvious over these references or the combination thereof. Holler appears to teach a dome-like structure built without a skeleton which may be used as an aircraft hangar.

However, Holler neither teaches nor fairly suggests design or operation of the hangar boundaries in such a way that the hall design allows the flying unit to fly freely and safely within the boundaries of the hall while preventing without safety risk the flying unit from leaving the hall and to collide with the boundaries. Jones appears to teach a mass transit vertically lifting air shuttle which flies in big cities between docking terminals. Jones, however, teaches nothing with regard to designed boundaries which limit a hall or a space and which prevent without safety risk a freely flying craft from leaving the hall or space. Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1, 2, and 8-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of these remarks and the above amendment.

CONCLUSION

For at least the above reasons, the currently pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance and notice thereof is requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Applicant hereby requests three month extension of time. Should any fees be due as a result of the filing of this response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the Deposit Account Number 06-0308, PSEE200021.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Eric Highman/

Eric Highman, Reg. No. 43,672

Fay, Sharpe, Fagan, Minnich & McKee, LLP
1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-2518
Telephone: 216/861-5582
Facsimile: 216/241-1666